

JCIO Projects and Current Status **June 29, 2005**

Summary Project Listing and Project Leads

SECURITY

Desktop Anti-Virus – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov
Instant Messaging – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov
Network Appliances – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov

INFRASTRUCTURE / NETWORKING

Data Center – Judy Peters, project lead - judy.peters@iwd.state.ia.us
Mainframes – Judy Peters, project lead - judy.peters@iwd.state.ia.us
Domain Name Service (DNS) – Larry Grund, project lead – larry.grund@iowa.gov
Virtual Private Network (VPN) – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov
Mike Bacino, project lead – mike.bacino@iowa.gov

PURCHASING

Cost Savings – Wes Hunsberger, project lead – wes.hunsberger@iowa.gov
Steve Mosena, project lead – smosena@dhs.iowa.gov

BUSINESS PROCESSES

Chart of Accounts – Rich Jacobs, project lead – richard.jacobs@idrf.state.ia.us
Return on Investment (ROI) – Rich Jacobs, project lead – richard.jacobs@idrf.state.ia.us
Communication Plan – Wes Hunsberger, project lead – wes.hunsberger@iowa.gov
Business Continuity – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov
Steve Mosena, project lead – smosena@dhs.iowa.gov
Standards – Steve Gast, project lead – steve.gast@iowa.gov
Enterprise Portfolio Management – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov
Identity Server – Steve Gast, project lead – steve.gast@iowa.gov
Project Management – Steve Gast, project lead – steve.gast@iowa.gov
Enterprise Architecture – on hold pending TGB discussion

(Detailed status reports for JCIO projects follow by category)

SECURITY

Desktop Anti-Virus – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov

NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT

This project has not been initiated, yet.

Instant Messaging – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov

NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT

Initial research, but team not yet formed.

Network Appliances – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov

NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT

DHS IDS Monitoring Pilot Project:

DHS has contracted with Symantec Corporation for monitoring, alerting and reporting services from IDS logs and associated information. DHS is managing the project independently and will report findings to the JCIO. The pilot is to run 60 days.

DOT IPS Pilot Project:

The DOT has acquired two Intrusion Prevention System (IPS) devices from two different vendors, installed them in primary network links, one servicing remote offices and the other linking to the ICN. They will be evaluating the effectiveness, performance, efficiency and other characteristics of the devices and reporting back to the JCIO.

INFRASTRUCTURE / NETWORKING

Data Center – Judy Peters, project lead - judy.peters@iwd.state.ia.us

NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT

Team Members:

JCIO's

Description:

Develop a migration strategy to implement one Class Certified Data Center within each building on the Capitol Complex for all servers. Determine based on business requirements within each building the level of Data Center Certification required within each building on the Capitol Complex. Establish an Enterprise facility cost for Data Center space within each Capital Complex building.

Current Status:

Documenting agencies located within each building on the Capitol Complex.

Identifying a checklist and documentation on certification requirements for all class levels of Data Centers.

JCIO's reaching consensus on scope and strategy of project.

Next steps:

JCIO's review and approve draft project document for project description.

Mainframes – Judy Peters, project lead - judy.peters@iwd.state.ia.us

NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT

Team Members:

Barbara Espeland, DOT, David Caines, ITE, Russ Rozinek, ITE, and Judy Peters, IWD

Description:

Document ROI and business considerations for various mainframe consolidation options for the mainframes located at DOT, JFHQ, ITE, and IWD.

Current Status:

Documenting costs for various options for continuation of the current data centers due to leases expiring on July 31, 2005 and inability to consolidate workload within this timeline.

Developing a survey document for all mainframe vendors to gather third party software cost for identified consolidation options to develop ROI.

Next steps:

Meeting scheduled with three data centers on June 20th to discuss agency needs and reach agreement on an Enterprise approach for the July 31, 2005 lease expiration.

DOT finalizing survey document to allow each agency to survey 1/3 of the vendors to gather final costs.

INFRASTRUCTURE / NETWORKING, cont.

Domain Name Service (DNS) – Larry Grund, project lead – larry.grund@iowa.gov

Team members:

JCIO Infrastructure committee (Department representatives knowledgeable in the department's DNS)

Description:

On June 15, 2005 the CIO membership held a meeting to discuss internal and external Domain Name Service (DNS).

Problem Statement:

The ICN has been experiencing continuing challenges with DNS servers and it is becoming increasingly difficult to manage. Recent events have caused various departments problems with domain name service by not coordinating DNS changes with the ICN. The result causes confusion and the unavailability of services such as e-mail or Internet access.

Twenty-seven people were in attendance from a variety of departments.

John Borden was kind enough to address the ICN issues at hand and assist in leading the discussion. ICN recommends it handle all external DNS and be the single point of contact for all public facing and 3rd party. ICN already offers this service at a cost of \$8.00 per month per DNS.

ITE believes that the cost of this service is excessive when the private sector offers the same service for \$20 per year. IDOT stated that the cost issue is a separate issue and could be handled via the Technology Governance Board.

ICN stated that Iowa Lottery.com will not be affected unless "state" is in the name.

ICN receives about 3 – 4 DNS requests per week that are not an ICN issue.

ITE has two main concerns: 1.) Central management and 2.) Education regarding DNS (who is primary is the basic question asked).

ITE stated we should focus on IA.GOV, IOWA.GOV, and STATE.IA.US

After some initial discussion the group began to identify the issues for both internal and external DNS:

Issues (External)	Issues (Internal)
Timing (Response, SLA)	Active Directory Dependency
Cost/Pricing	• Replication
Agency Coordination	• Logon
Ownership	IP/NAT
• Education	Timing
• Who to Contact	Security
Server to use on PC's	Clustering/Load balancing
Communication (ICN & ITE)	HIPAA requirement

INFRASTRUCTURE / NETWORKING, cont.

Domain Name Service (DNS), cont.

Ten Haken, Darwin [DAS] comments **on internal DNS issues:**

“Many agencies are utilizing Microsoft’s Active Directory internally. AD is based on the internal DNS setup and is typically specific to the AD Forest. As part of troubleshooting AD replication issues it is common to have to verify and even manually correct DNS SRV records. This type of direct management level access to the internal DNS is needed at all hours of the day.

DNS also plays a vital part in every login for AD customers. If the AD infrastructure spans WAN sites it is common to setup DNS on servers local to the users to ensure logins even when the WAN link is down. These down level servers are then set to forward to parent AD DNS servers. This setup will vary for state agencies with their own AD forest.

In general with AD if you are having issues the very 1st item on Microsoft’s checklist is to verify and fix DNS. This would be tough to do if it was centrally managed without 1st having a centralized AD forest.

It was also pointed out that some internal DNS setups have been put in place to due to security reason as is the case with the ITE security team.”

Chris Rhodes (DAS/ITE) brought to the group’s attention that the real issue is no more than communicating between the various DNS administrators. Chris volunteered to develop a template to be used as a central directory of a single point of contact that would include:

- 1.) List of all DNS and who is responsible,
- 2.) Show the interdependencies of the DNS

Discussion was held about how to distribute this information to the various agencies.

INFRASTRUCTURE / NETWORKING, cont.

Virtual Private Network (VPN) – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov
Mike Bacino, project lead – mike.bacino@iowa.gov

Team members:

Kevin Kammermeier, Don Petsche, Carl Martin, Dave Rowen, Ray Hague, Rob Buchwald, Mark Lumsden, Harry Carver, Mike Bacino and Greg Fay

Description:

Define a common VPN service to meet the needs of the enterprise to reduce hardware, software and support costs. Determine and address issues, architect solution, define timeline, etc. Recommend moving to a common solution, maintaining status quo, or another service model.

Current status:

The group held three meetings. The first was focused on understanding the current environment and issues to consolidating services. The second focused on customer needs, business drivers and issues, technical concerns, and commonalities of service. At the last meeting they drilled into specific needs if a central VPN service were defined.

Next steps:

The group will meet again in the next two weeks to continue the discussion of needs and issues around developing a centrally managed VPN service.

PURCHASING

Cost Savings – Wes Hunsberger, project lead – wes.hunsberger@iowa.gov
Steve Mosena, project lead – smosena@dhs.iowa.gov

Team Members:

Wes Hunsberger

Description:

Develop a spreadsheet for agencies to record cost savings on various enterprise initiatives. Initiatives identified by Wes (with help provided by Rich Jacobs) are: desktop purchasing, laptop purchasing, IBM Passport licenses, Computer Associates agreement, Oracle licenses, Veritas email Enterprise Vault and mainframe leases.

Current Status:

Final version of cost savings spreadsheet was sent to CIO Council members with a due date of close of business on July 1 for completion.

Fifteen (15) agencies reported so far, with 6 agencies reporting savings and 9 agencies with zero savings.

Those agencies reporting zero savings are primarily in three categories:

- The majority report they have zero money in their budgets for any IT purchases,
- One agency reports the HP standard configuration does not meet their agency's needs, and
- One agency reports zero savings because they recently lost their CIO and are unsure of the savings for their agency.

With 15 agencies reporting:

Total estimated savings for FY05: **\$455,077**

Total estimated savings for FY06: **\$339,371**

Next steps:

Compile final version of total cost savings for delivery on July 5 for John Gillispie and TGB.

BUSINESS PROCESSES

Chart of Accounts – Rich Jacobs, project lead – richard.jacobs@idrf.state.ia.us

Team Members:

Erv Fett, IWD, Joel Lunde, DOM, Dave Heuton, DPS, Dave Ritchie, DAS-SAE, Roger Stirler, Ed, Sandy Scheib, DOC, Ron Juelfs, DOT, Marcia Spangler, DPH, Rich Jacobs, IDR

Description:

Redesign of the I/3 Object Class and Codes which relate to information technology. Project was completed in conjunction with members of Financial Users Group, DAS-SAE and DOM. Goals were to simplify coding system and to facilitate the preparation of future mandated reports on information technology spending.

Current Status:

Recommendations have been sent to DOM and DAS-SAE for implementation for use in establishing spending plans for FY 06 and in managing expenditures occurring in FY 06 and beyond.

Changes in codes include:

1. Creation of new Object Class for IT Outside Services—should be used to manage expenditures for services purchased outside of state government. Intended that expenditures previously managed under such classes as Professional and Scientific Services and Outside Repair Services will now be managed in this class. A definition of IT Services has been provided.
2. Corresponding with #1, 6 Object Codes previously existing in 405 Professional and Scientific have been eliminated.
3. Simplification of Data Processing Equipment coding by elimination of 504 Data Processing Inventory and 540 Data Processing Non-Inventory which previously contained approximately 90 object codes. This is replaced with a new object class 510 Equipment with a total of 24 object codes
4. At this time no changes were recommended to the coding for personal services relating to technology spending on state resources

Next steps:

Implementation within Financial and Budget Systems
Additional information to agencies may be desirable to insure that agencies are aware of changes and understand the use the information that will be made of the information

BUSINESS PROCESSES, cont.

Return on Investment (ROI) – Rich Jacobs, project lead – richard.jacobs@idrf.state.ia.us

Team Members:

Lee Tack, Ed, Harold Bowman, ICN, Rich Jacobs, IDR

Description:

Simplification of the application and evaluation process for requests for funds from Pooled Technology Fund. Revisions included:

1. Increase in emphasis placed on projects that will benefit state government as an enterprise or multiple agencies
2. Applications continue to be encouraged from all agencies for all information technology projects that demonstrate a positive return on investment.

Changes made include:

1. Application simplified to be primarily a narrative offering limited opportunity to explain project and expected results. Removed specific questions which had “guided” preparation and provided a brief description of what to describe in each of three areas.
2. Financial analysis- removed detail of budget estimate by line item and estimates of useful life. Retained a breakdown of costs and benefits. Provided opportunity to discuss “intangible benefits”

Current Status:

Revised application was distributed to CIO’s by Diane Van Zante Email on June 20

Next steps:

Schedule of steps contained in ROI application include:

- Agency completes Return on Investment Application July 15
- JCIO completes identification of JCIO initiatives and completes applications by July 31
- JCIO evaluation of all applications completed by August 15
- Recommendations reviewed by TGB by September 30
- Recommendations forwarded to DOM by October 1st budget deadline

BUSINESS PROCESSES, cont.

Communication Plan – Wes Hunsberger, project lead – wes.hunsberger@iowa.gov

Team Members:

Wes Hunsberger

Description:

Develop a method to communicate with various groups within state government about the TGB and the JCIO. Methods of communication include a newsletter delivered by email and a combined website for both the TGB and the JCIO.

Current Status:

Iowa Interactive has designed the website and is making some changes to the initial design. Website should be operational with loaded documents by July 1. July 1 date may change to July 8, due to shifting priorities of Iowa Interactive.

Initial newsletter will be timed to be distributed when the TGB is formed and has their initial board meeting.

Next steps:

Load initial documents to website. Iowa Interactive is still working on the JCIO section of the website. Project updates will be loaded to an area on this site.

Business Continuity – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov

Steve Mosena, project lead – smosena@dhs.iowa.gov

Team Members:

Steve Mosena and Greg Fay. Other members to be added.

Description:

DHS has purchased software to aid in the development, maintenance and implementation of business continuity plans. They have offered to share the software with the enterprise and the Information Security Office has agreed to purchase additional concurrent licenses for others. This group will address enterprise-wide planning needs and recommend projects to meet them.

Current Status:

Plans are being made to move the DHS server with the business continuity software to the ITE server farm, so other departments can access it. The Information Security Office has made a commitment to purchase additional licenses to allow others use.

Next Steps:

Planning how to most efficiently provide access to the system and how to assist users in effective use of the software.

BUSINESS PROCESSES, cont.

Standards – Steve Gast, project lead – steve.gast@iowa.gov

NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT

Team Members:

CIOC Standards Subcommittee Members

Description:

Provide extended staff to review, discuss, document and format recommendations concerning IT Standards

Current Status:

- Common Calendaring Standard S-003-002 draft being worked on with C. Stratemeyer
- Email Naming Standard S-006-002 meetings to be held in second week of July

Next steps:

Set up meeting date and location to discuss Email Name Standard. Send out notice to all CIO Council members.

Enterprise Portfolio Management – Greg Fay, project lead - greg.fay@iowa.gov

Team Members:

RJ Hellstern, Rick Hindman, Steve Gast, Rich Jacobs and Greg Fay.

Description:

The EPfMO group was formed in response to a question raised at a JCIO meeting; i.e. should TGB administration funds be used to hire an outside firm to help us develop the Enterprise Portfolio Management Office? The JCIO members did not have a consistent view of what the EPfMO should be, so it was decided that a subgroup should address the issue.

Current status:

The group met on June 23rd. They reached a consensus view of what the EPfMO should look like. Notes from the meeting were distributed to team members and one set of comments was received. The notes have been updated.

Next steps:

The meeting notes will be distributed to the JCIO for comment. A consensus view of the full JCIO will be sought.

BUSINESS PROCESSES, cont.

Identity Server – Steve Gast, project lead – steve.gast@iowa.gov

NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT

Team Members:

Balance of team not yet identified

Description:

Investigate becoming a certificate service provider using SAML 1.0 compliant software under Federal Identity Credentialing (HSPD-12)

Resources:

[<http://www.eapartnership.org/>](http://www.eapartnership.org/)
[<http://cio.gov/eaauthentication/>](http://cio.gov/eaauthentication/)

Current Status:

- Project to begin in July

Next steps:

None identified at this time

Project Management – Steve Gast, project lead – steve.gast@iowa.gov

NO CHANGE FROM PREVIOUS REPORT

Team Members:

DOT, Steve Gast; IDPH, Jennifer Hollingsworth; DHS, Thomas Huisman;
DAS, Greg Fay; DAS, Mark Uhrin; IVH, Carol Ward

Description:

This project is intended to assess the state of project management within the various agencies of the state. Upon completion of that assessment, it is expected that a project management lifecycle would be defined which incorporates project management best practices with elements common to the process of agencies.

Current Status:

- Adopted project initiation document
- Researched PMI's OPM3 Maturity Model for evaluating project, program and portfolio management
- Reviewed internal forms used by team members, NOREX, and other sources such as Iowa's ROI program

Next steps:

- Design common acceptable model form for use by all JCIO agencies.
- Schedule meeting in early July

Enterprise Architecture –

This JCIO project is on hold pending TGB discussion.